

display site at a site remote from the content display site comprises electronically receiving the monitoring information at the remote site via the Internet.

*H/B
Concl
S/J*

241. The monitoring system of claim 135 wherein the monitoring system begins the monitoring at the beginning of the display of the content, and wherein the monitoring system arrests the monitoring at the end of the display of the content.

REMARKS

Claim 66-85 and 101-241 are now in the application. The amendments made to the specification as indicated above have been made to conform the specification of the present application to the specification of the parent application.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner required correction of the drawings as indicated by the Draftsman. However, no Draftsman's comments were attached to the Office Action.

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the title of the application as not being descriptive. However, the present title is descriptive of the present invention because the invention pertains to a content display monitor. On the other hand, the title suggested by the Examiner may itself be mis-descriptive because one or more embodiments of the present invention may pertain to web enabled devices other than computers. Accordingly, applicant has not amended the title.

In paragraphs 6A and 6B of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 101-115, 126-133, and 135-139 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner in particular objects to the phrase "content display site" apparently asserting that this phrase relates to a data structure. Applicant is uncertain what the Examiner means by a data structure. It is not likely that the Examiner means that a data structure is a program executable by a processor, because computer programs are statutory subject matter. Further, it is not likely that the Examiner means that a data structure is a database

format, because database formats are also statutory subject matter.

If the Examiner means that a data structure is data per se, then a content display site is not a data structure. For example, claim 101 requires the content display site and to receive at least a portion of content from a web site, to monitor display of the content, to produce monitoring information regarding the content display, and to electronically transmit the monitoring information. Data per se could not receive at least a portion of content from a web site, monitor display of the content, produce monitoring information regarding the content display, and electronically transmit the monitoring information. Therefore, a content display site cannot be data.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 101-115 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is not well founded.

As another example, claim 126 is directed to a system which monitors the position of content on a display screen, which produces monitoring information indicating the

position, and which electronically transmits the monitoring information to a remote site. A data structure as defined by the Examiner could not monitor the position of content on a display screen, produce monitoring information indicating the position, and electronically transmit the monitoring information to a remote site. Therefore, a content display site cannot be data.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 126-133 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is not well founded.

As yet another example, claim 135 is directed to a monitoring system at a content display site which ascertains the beginning of display of content on a display screen, which ascertains the end of the display of the content, and which monitors the display of the content. A data structure as defined by the Examiner could not ascertain the beginning of display of content on a display screen, ascertain the end of the display of the content, and monitor the display of the content. Therefore, a content display site cannot be data.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 126-133 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is not well founded.

In paragraph 6C of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 66, 67, 116, 140, and 161 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner in particular apparently asserts that these claims are not directed to a practical application because they do not contain any specific limitations. However, these claims are directed to a practical application and they do contain specific limitations.

For example, claim 66 is directed to a method of monitoring the display of content. One exemplary practical application of this method is to determine which users are exposed to which on-line advertisements. If an advertisement does not have an appropriate position on a display, a user is not effectively exposed to the advertisement. Thus advertisers can determine whether users are seeing their advertisements.

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

Also, claim 66 includes the specific limitations of monitoring the position of content on a display and evaluating the position.

Accordingly, because claim 66 is directed to a practical application and contains specific limitations, the Examiner's rejection of claim 66 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is not well founded.

As another example, claim 67 is directed to a computer readable storage medium having program code stored thereon. The program code, when executed by a computer, monitors display of content received over the Internet, generates monitoring data resulting from the content monitoring, and electronically transfers the monitoring data to a remote location. One exemplary practical application of this method is to determine which content is being viewed by which users.

Also, claim 67 includes the specific limitations of monitoring display of content received over the Internet, generating monitoring data resulting from the content

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

monitoring, and electronically transferring the monitoring data to a remote location.

Accordingly, because claim 67 is directed to a practical application and contains specific limitations, the Examiner's rejection of claim 67 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is not well founded.

As yet another example, claim 116 is directed to a method of monitoring content being displayed at a content display site. One exemplary practical application of this method is to determine which content is being viewed by which users.

Also, claim 116 includes the specific limitations of monitoring the display of the content at the content display site to produce monitoring information regarding the display of the content, and electronically transmitting the monitoring information from the content display site to a monitoring site.

Accordingly, because claim 116 is directed to a practical application and contains specific limitations, the

Examiner's rejection of claim 116 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is not well founded.

As yet another example, claim 140 is directed to a method of monitoring the display of content at a content display site. One exemplary practical application of this method is to determine which content is being viewed by which users.

Also, claim 140 includes the specific limitations of receiving a monitoring program at a content display site from a remote site, and of monitoring display of the content in accordance with the monitoring program.

Accordingly, because claim 140 is directed to a practical application and contains specific limitations, the Examiner's rejection of claim 140 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is not well founded.

As a further example, claim 161 is directed to a method of monitoring the display at a content display site of content that is provided by a content provider site over the Internet. As before, one exemplary practical

application of this method is to determine which content is being viewed by which users.

Also, claim 161 includes the specific limitations of monitoring display of the content to produce monitoring information, and transferring the monitoring information from the content display site to a remote site via the Internet.

Accordingly, because claim 161 is directed to a practical application and contains specific limitations, the Examiner's rejection of claim 161 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is not well founded.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected certain claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant is uncertain which claims are being rejected because, in one sentence of paragraph 8, the Examiner refers to claims 66 and 116, and in another sentence the Examiner refers to claims 116 and 163. For purposes of this document, application will assume that the Examiner meant claims 66, 116, and 163 because, later in paragraph 8, the Examiner refers to the claims

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

dependent upon claims 116 and 163 and also refers to claim 66.

With regard to claims 116 and 163, the Examiner asserts that these claims must be directed to a computer implemented method to clarify a field of use. However, 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, does not require that claims recite a field of use.

Accordingly, because 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, does not require that claims recite a field of use, the Examiner's rejection of claims 116 and 163 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is not well founded.

The Examiner rejected claim 66 asserting that claim 66 lacked antecedent in two respects. Claim 66 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 66-85 and 101-181 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Curran GB Patent in view of the Brown reference and the Capps patent, and further in view of Office Notice.

Claim 66 is directed to a method in which the position of content on a display is monitored and evaluated. The Examiner asserts that the Curran GB patent discloses both the monitoring of displayed content and the monitoring of a position of an image on a display. Applicant disagrees.

The Curran GB patent discloses the use of the signals generating a display on a display device to provide a user with an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by the display device. Thus, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent does not monitor anything as required by claim 67. For example, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent is not concerned with how content is displayed and/or how content is provided to a user but only with producing a representation of the display itself. As can be seen, the Curran GB patent and claim 67 are not even directed to the same invention.

The Examiner also asserts that the Curran GB patent discloses monitoring of position of content. This assertion is likewise not correct. The Curran GB patent

discloses detection of position signals so as to produce an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by a display device. Detecting the position control signals does not constitute monitoring of the position of the content but, rather, enables addressing of pixels of an image display. Such addressing is necessary in order to accomplish the desired goal of producing an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by a display device.

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterization of the Curran GB patent is a premise of the Examiner's rejection, and because this premise is not correct, the rejection of claim 66 must fail.

The Examiner also asserts that the Brown reference discloses the determination of the duration of time that a display is hidden by other images and that this determination is the same thing as evaluating a position of a content display. The Examiner particularly points to pp. 205, 805, and 720 and 721 of the Brown reference. Pages 720 and 721 of the Brown reference disclose the concept of using

an image as a background in a browser's window. However, applicant cannot see where these pages disclose the determination of the duration of time that content is hidden much less evaluating a position of content on a display. Page 805 discusses the use of a HIDDEN element in a page generated by a CGI script. This discussion is not a discussion of a hidden image and there is no discussion on this page of determining the duration of time that an image is hidden. Page 205 was not provided by the Examiner but, in view of the disclosure at pp. 720, 721, and 805, it is unlikely that this page discloses the determination of the duration of time that content is hidden.

The Examiner also asserts that the Capps patent at column 12, lines 64-67 discloses evaluation of a position of content on a display. However, this portion of the Capps patent merely discloses that a variable TIED can be set to a value of either true or false thereby indicating whether the event start time variable may be available for setting by the user or may be hidden from the user. As can be easily seen, the Capps patent does not disclose anything regarding

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

a determination of whether content is hidden or for long the content is hidden.

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterizations of the Brown reference and the Capps patent are premises of the Examiner's rejection, and because these premises are not correct, the rejection of claim 66 must fail.

The Examiner's Office Notice is not pertinent to claim 66.

Claim 67 is directed to a computer readable storage medium having program code stored thereon which, when executed by a computer, causes the display of content received over the Internet to be monitored, causes monitoring data resulting from the content monitoring to be generated, and causes the monitoring data to be electronically transmitted to a remote location. The Examiner asserts that the Curran GB patent discloses the monitoring of displayed content. Applicant disagrees.

The Curran GB patent discloses the use of the signals generating a display on a display device to provide

a user with an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by the display device. Thus, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent does not monitor anything as required by claim 67. For example, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent is not concerned with how content is displayed and/or how content is provided to a user but only with producing a representation of the display itself. As can be seen, the Curran GB patent and claim 67 are not even directed to the same invention.

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterization of the Curran GB patent is a premise of the Examiner's rejection, and because this premise is not correct, the rejection of claim 67 must fail.

The Examiner must also be of the view that the Curran GB patent, the Brown reference, and/or the Capps patent disclose the electronic transmission of the information resulting from the monitoring to a remote location. However, neither the Curran GB patent nor the Brown reference nor the Capps patent discloses this feature of claim 67.

Accordingly, for this reason also, the rejection of claim 67 must fail.

The Examiner's reliance on the Brown reference, the Capps patent and the Examiner's Official Notice are not pertinent because none of these documents discloses the monitoring of content as required to claim 67.

Claims 116 and 162 are directed to a method in which content displayed at a content display site is monitored so as to produce monitoring information and in which the monitoring information is transferred to a monitoring site. The Examiner asserts that the Curran GB patent discloses the monitoring of content displayed at a content display site. Applicant disagrees.

As discussed above, the Curran GB patent discloses the use of the signals generating a display on a display device to provide a user with an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by the display device. Thus, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent does not monitor anything as required by claims 116 and 162. For example, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent is not

concerned with how content is displayed and/or how content is provided to a user but only with producing a representation of the display itself. As can be seen, the Curran GB patent and claims 116 and 162 are not even directed to the same invention.

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterization of the Curran GB patent is a premise of the Examiner's rejection, and because this premise is not correct, the rejection of claims 116 and 162 must fail.

The Examiner must also be of the view that the Curran GB patent, the Brown reference, and/or the Capps patent disclose the transfer of the information resulting from the monitoring to a remote location. However, neither the Curran GB patent nor the Brown reference nor the Capps patent discloses this feature of claims 116 and 162.

Accordingly, for this reason also, the rejection of claims 116 and 162 must fail.

Claim 126 is directed to a system that monitors the position of content on a display so as to produce

monitoring information and that electronically transmits the monitoring information to a remote site.

The Curran GB patent discloses the use of the signals generating a display on a display device to provide a user with an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by the display device. Thus, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent does not monitor anything as required by claim 126. For example, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent is not concerned with how content is displayed and/or how content is provided to a user but only with producing a representation of the display itself. As can be seen, the Curran GB patent and claim 126 are not even directed to the same invention.

The Examiner also asserts that the Curran GB patent discloses monitoring of position of content. This assertion is likewise not correct. The Curran GB patent discloses detection of position signals so as to provide an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by a display device. Detecting the position control signals does not constitute monitoring of the position of the content

but, rather, enables addressing of pixels of an image display. Such addressing is necessary in order to accomplish the desired goal of producing an accurate representation of the display.

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterization of the Curran GB patent is a premise of the Examiner's rejection, and because this premise is not correct, the rejection of claim 126 must fail.

The Examiner must also be of the view that the Curran GB patent, the Brown reference, and the Capps patent disclose the electronic transmission of the information resulting from the monitoring to a remote location. However, neither the Curran GB patent nor the Brown reference nor the Capps patent discloses this feature of claim 126.

Accordingly, for this reason also, the rejection of claim 126 must fail.

Claim 134 is directed to a method for monitoring display of content at a content display site such that a change in time of a characteristic of the content is

monitored to produce monitoring information and that the monitoring information is electronically transmitted to a remote site over the Internet.

The Curran GB patent discloses the use of the signals generating a display on a display device to provide a user with an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by the display device. The Curran GB patent discloses nowhere that a change in time of a characteristic of content is monitored.

The Examiner also asserts that the Brown reference and the Capps patent disclose the determination of the duration of time that a display is hidden by other images. The Examiner must then be of the view that such a determination is equivalent to monitoring a change in time of a characteristic of content. Even assuming this view is correct, and as discussed above, the arrangements disclosed in the Brown reference and in the Capps patent do not disclose determination of the duration of time that a display is hidden by other images.

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterization of the Curran GB patent, the Brown reference, and the Capps patent are premises of the Examiner's rejection, and because these premises are not correct, the rejection of claim 134 must fail.

The Examiner must also be of the view that the Curran GB patent, the Brown reference, and the Capps patent disclose the electronic transmission of the information resulting from the monitoring to a remote location. However, neither the Curran GB patent nor the Brown reference nor the Capps patent discloses this feature of claim 134.

Accordingly, for this reason also, the rejection of claim 134 must fail.

Claim 135 is directed to a monitoring system in which the beginning of display of content is ascertained, the end of the display of the content is ascertained, and the display of the content is monitored.

The Curran GB patent discloses the use of the signals generating a display on a display device to provide

a user with an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by the display device. Thus, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent does not monitor anything as required by claim 135. For example, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent is not concerned with how content is displayed and/or how content is provided to a user but only with producing a representation of the display itself. As can be seen, the Curran GB patent and claim 135 are not even directed to the same invention. Likewise, neither the Brown reference nor the Capps patent disclose monitoring of content.

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterization of the Curran GB patent, the Brown reference, and the Capps patent are premises of the Examiner's rejection, and because these premises are not correct, the rejection of claim 135 must fail.

Also, neither the Curran GB patent, nor Brown reference, and nor Capps patent discloses or suggests ascertaining the beginning or the end of the display of content.

Accordingly, for this reason also, the rejection of claim 135 must fail.

Claims 140 and 148 are directed to a method in which a monitoring program is received at a content display site from a remote site and in which display of the content is monitored in accordance with the monitoring program.

The Curran GB patent discloses the use of the signals generating a display on a display device to provide a user with an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by the display device. Thus, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent does not monitor anything as required by claims 140 and 148. For example, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent is not concerned with how content is displayed and/or how content is provided to a user but only with producing a representation of the display itself. As can be seen, the Curran GB patent and claims 140 and 148 are not even directed to the same invention. Likewise, neither the Brown reference nor the Capps patent disclose monitoring of content.

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterization of the Curran GB patent, the Brown reference, and the Capps patent are premises of the Examiner's rejection, and because these premises are not correct, the rejection of claims 140 and 148 must fail.

Also, neither the Curran GB patent, nor Brown reference, nor the Capps patent discloses or suggests receiving a monitoring program at a content display site. Accordingly, the Examiner takes Official Notice that programs are transmitted over the Internet. However, there is no suggestion in any of these references to use a monitoring program much less to transmit a monitoring program to a content display site. Without such a suggestion, a rejection of claims 140 and 148 is unwarranted.

Accordingly, for this reason also, the rejection of claims 140 and 148 must fail.

Claim 163 is directed to a method of monitoring the display of content at a content display site so as to produce monitoring information.

The Curran GB patent discloses the use of the signals generating a display on a display device to provide a user with an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by the display device. Thus, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent does not monitor anything as required by claim 163. For example, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent is not concerned with how content is displayed and/or how content is provided to a user but only with producing a representation of the display itself. As can be seen, the Curran GB patent and claim 163 is not even directed to the same invention. Likewise, neither the Brown reference nor the Capps patent disclose monitoring of content.

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterization of the Curran GB patent, the Brown reference, and the Capps patent are premises of the Examiner's rejection, and because these premises are not correct, the rejection of claim 163 must fail.

Claim 167 is directed to a computer network in which content is downloaded from a first server, in which an

executable is downloaded from a second server, in which the executable is arranged to determine the amount of time that the content downloaded from the first server is displayed by a client, in which viewer identifying indicia is obtained, and in which the viewer identifying indicia and the amount of time determined by the executable are uploaded to a third server.

As discussed above, the Curran GB patent discloses the use of the signals generating a display on a display device to provide a user with an accurate representation of what is actually displayed by the display device. Thus, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent does not monitor anything as required by claims 116 and 162. For example, the apparatus disclosed in the Curran GB patent is not concerned with how content is displayed and/or how content is provided to a user but only with producing a representation of the display itself. As can be seen, the Curran GB patent and claim 167 are not even directed to the same invention.

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

Accordingly, because the Examiner's characterization of the Curran GB patent is a premise of the Examiner's rejection, and because this premise is not correct, the rejection of claim 167 must fail.

The Examiner must also be of the view that the Curran GB patent, the Brown reference, and the Capps patent disclose the uploading of monitoring information to a server. However, neither the Curran GB patent nor the Brown reference nor the Capps patent discloses this feature of claim 167.

Accordingly, for this reason also, the rejection of claim 167 must fail.

Moreover, claim 167 requires obtaining and uploading viewer identifying data. Neither the Curran GB patent nor the Brown reference nor the Capps patent discloses this feature of claim 167.

Accordingly, for this reason also, the rejection of claim 167 must fail.

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 66-85 and 101-181 under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over the Curran GB Patent in view of the Brown reference and the Cannon patent, and further in view of Official Notice.

In this rejection, the Examiner states that the rationale used in the rejection as set out in paragraph 10 also applies to the paragraph 11 rejection. However, applicant has shown above that claims 66-85 and 101-181 are patentable over the art applied in paragraph 10. Therefore, if the same rationale applies to the paragraph 11 rejection as applied to the paragraph 10 rejection, then claim 66-85 and 101-181 are patentable for the reasons given above.

Because the independent claims in the group of claims containing claims 66-85 and 101-181 are patentable, the dependent claims in the group of claims containing claims 66-85 and 101-181 are also patentable.

Newly added claims 182-241 are claims of varying scope all directed to the monitoring of content. As discussed above, none of the applied references discloses the monitoring of content. Accordingly, the combination of these references cannot meet the limitations of the claims.

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE.**"

In view of the above, allowance of the claims of the present patent application and issuance of this patent application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, O'TOOLE, GERSTEIN,
MURRAY & BORUN

By:



Trevor B. Joike
Reg. No. 25,542
Attorneys for Applicants
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606-6402
(312) 474-6300

April 30, 2001

Application No. 09/490,495

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE
IN THE SPECIFICATION

The sentence beginning at page 1, lines 5 and 6,
has been amended as follows:

This invention relates to monitoring the display
[and] [observation] of content by a computer system and
observation of the content.

The sentence beginning at page 16, lines 17-22,
has been amended as follows:

In yet a further aspect of the invention, the
display of content that is provided by a content provider
site over a network to the content display site is monitored
to produce monitoring information, then the monitoring
information is transferred to a remote site of the
[computer] network that is different from the content
provider site.

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

The sentence beginning at page 17, lines 21-27,
has been amended as follows:

This aspect of the invention relieves the primary content provider of the need to manage the storage of content, while reserving control over the provision of that content to the primary content provider, thereby enabling the content provider to ensure that the bandwidth requirement of the content provided from the content provider site are met.

The sentence beginning at page 18 line 32 through page 19, line 3, has been amended as follows:

In particular, the invention can enable monitoring of the displayed content in a manner that provides monitoring information from which aspects of the [user's] observer's observation of the content can be gleaned.

The sentence beginning at page 21, lines 4-7, has been amended as follows:

Review of the monitoring information produced by the monitoring instructions can enable conclusions regarding the [user's] observer's observation of the content to be deduced, as explained in more detail below.

The sentence beginning at page 38, lines 17-23, has been amended as follows:

Or, the display of the content can be ordered so that the content that must be displayed ("required content") is displayed first; if the monitoring method detects that the content display site is displaying the other content without first having displayed the required content, then suppression of the required content has been detected.

The sentence beginning at page 44, line 33 through page 45, line 5, has been amended as follows:

In the embodiment of the invention illustrated in [FIG. 5] FIGS. 5A, 5B, and 5C, a user interface (e.g., GUI)

can be provided on the content provider site computer to enable the owner (or representative) of the content provider site to access monitoring information stored at the application manager site regarding content displays provided by the content provider site.

The sentence beginning at page 46, lines 5-7, has been amended as follows:

This embodiment of the invention also can enable all of the functionality described above for the system illustrated in [FIGS] FIGS. 5A, 5B and 5C.

The sentence beginning at page 47, lines 26-28, has been amended as follows:

The primary content provider user interface can provide the same functionality as described above with respect to [FIG. 5] FIGS. 5A, 5B, and 5C.

The sentence beginning at page 48, lines 15-17,
has been amended as follows:

The secondary content user interface can also provide functionality similar to that described above with respect to [FIG. 5] FIGS. 5A, 5B, and 5C.

The sentence beginning at page 48, lines 21-27,
has been amended as follows:

The embodiment of the invention shown in [FIG. 6] FIGS. 6A, 6B, 6C, and 6D facilitates interaction between the primary content provider site 602 and the secondary content provider site 601 to enable a secondary content provider to easily and flexibly provide content to a primary content provider in a manner that enables both the primary and secondary content providers to exercise control over the provision of content.

IN THE CLAIMS

Claim 66 has been amended as follows:

66. (Amended) A method for monitoring [the] a display of content by a computer system, comprising:
monitoring [the] a position of the content display on a display screen of the computer system; and evaluating the position of the content display on the display screen to produce monitoring information regarding display of the content.

Claims 182-241 have been added as follows:

182. An automated system for monitoring display of content on a display screen at a content display site in order to produce monitoring information regarding the display of the content, wherein at least a portion of the content is received by the content display site via the Internet from a content provider site.

183. The automated system of claim 182 further arranged to electronically transmit the monitoring information to a monitoring site.

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

184. The automated system of claim 183 wherein a program to produce the monitoring information is received at the content display site from a program supply site.

185. The automated system of claim 184 wherein the content display site and the program supply site are the same site.

186. The automated system of claim 184 wherein the content provider site and the monitoring site are the same site.

187. The automated system of claim 184 wherein the content provider site and the program supply site are the same site.

188. The automated system of claim 184 wherein the monitoring site and the program supply site are the same site.

189. The automated system of claim 184 wherein the content provider site, the monitoring site, and the program supply site are the same site.

190. The automated system of claim 182 wherein the content has a position on the display screen, and wherein the monitoring information includes data about the position of the content on the display screen.

191. The automated system of claim 182 wherein the monitoring information includes data about whether at least a portion of the content is occluded.

192. The automated system of claim 191 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration of the occlusion.

193. The automated system of claim 182 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration of non-occlusion of the content.

194. The automated system of claim 182 wherein the monitoring information includes data about a cursor being positioned over the content on the display screen.

195. The automated system of claim 182 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration that the content is displayed on the display screen.

196. The automated system of claim 182 wherein the monitoring information includes data about selection of a hyperlink within an area of the content.

197. The automated system of claim 182 wherein the monitoring information includes demographic information.

198. The automated system of claim 182 wherein the monitoring information includes data about whether at least a portion of the content is invisible to a user.

199. The automated system of claim 198 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration of the invisibility.

200. The automated system of claim 182 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration of visibility of the content to a user.

201. An automated system for monitoring display of a part of content on a display screen at a content display site in order to produce monitoring information regarding the display of the content part, wherein at least a portion of the content is received by the content display site via the Internet from a content provider site.

202. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the content part is an advertisement.

203. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the content part is an ad banner.

204. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the content part is a gif file.

205. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the content part is a text entry made by a user.

206. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the content part is video content.

207. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the content part is audio content.

208. The automated system of claim 201 further arranged to electronically transmit the monitoring information to a remote monitoring site.

209. The automated system of claim 208 wherein a program to produce the monitoring information is received at the content display site via the Internet from a remote program site.

210. The automated system of claim 209 wherein the remote monitoring site and the remote program site are the same remote site.

211. The automated system of claim 209 wherein the content provider site and the remote monitoring site are the same site.

212. The automated system of claim 209 wherein the content provider site and the remote program site are the same site.

213. The automated system of claim 209 wherein the content provider site, the remote monitoring site, and the remote program site are the same site.

214. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the content part has a position on the display screen, and wherein the monitoring information includes data about the position of the content part on the display screen.

215. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the monitoring information includes data about whether the content part is occluded.

216. The automated system of claim 215 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration of the occlusion.

217. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration of non-occlusion of the content part.

218. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the monitoring information includes data about a cursor being positioned over the content part on the display screen.

219. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration that the content part is displayed on the display screen.

220. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the monitoring information includes data about selection of a hyperlink within an area of the content.

221. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the monitoring information includes demographic information.

222. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the monitoring information includes data about whether the content part is invisible to a user.

223. The automated system of claim 222 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration of the invisibility.

224. The automated system of claim 201 wherein the monitoring information includes data about the duration of visibility of the content part to a user.

225. A method of collecting information about content being displayed on a display screen at a content display site, wherein at least part of the content is received at the content display site from a content provider site via the Internet, the method comprising:

providing the content to a content display monitor at the content display site, wherein the content display monitor is arranged to monitor a display of the content at the content display site in order to produce monitoring information regarding the display of the content; and,

receiving the monitoring information from the content display site at a site remote from the content display site.

226. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor is provided by the remote site.

227. The method of claim 226 wherein the remote site is a web site.

228. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor monitors the position of the content.

229. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor monitors at least a part of the content.

230. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor determines whether the content is at least partially occluded.

231. The method of claim 230 wherein the content display monitor determines the duration of the occlusion.

232. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor determines the duration of non-occlusion of the content.

233. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor generates data relating to a cursor being positioned over the content.

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

234. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor monitors the duration that the content is displayed.

235. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor monitors selection of a hyperlink within an area of the content.

236. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor acquires demographic information.

237. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor determines whether at least a portion of the content is invisible to a user.

238. The method of claim 237 wherein the content display monitor determines the duration of the invisibility.

Attorney Docket
28049/36074

239. The method of claim 225 wherein the content display monitor determines the duration of visibility of the content to a user.

240. The method of claim 225 wherein the receiving of the monitoring information from the content display site at a site remote from the content display site comprises electronically receiving the monitoring information at the remote site via the Internet.

241. The monitoring system of claim 135 wherein the monitoring system begins the monitoring at the beginning of the display of the content, and wherein the monitoring system arrests the monitoring at the end of the display of the content.